

II. Claims

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-9, and in particular, to claims 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. By this Amendment, Applicant submits that such objections are overcome.

Further, the Examiner has rejected claims 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. By this Amendment, Applicant submits that such rejections are overcome.

Since no prior art references have been applied to claims 3 and 5-9, Applicant submits that claims 3 and 5-9 are now clearly in condition for allowance.

Further, Applicant has added new claims 10 and 11. Applicant submits that claim 10 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency upon claim 1, and claim 11 is patentable for at least analogous reasons as presented below for claim 1.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by *Mesko* (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,299). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the following remarks.

Mesko discloses summing (either by 72, summing signals from couplers 74 and 76 or by 80 which inherently sums signals from 60 and 62) of dual RF signals from a diversity transmitter 20 before inputting the summed RF signal into a signal quality measurer 70 via a RF down-